

REMARKS

Claims 2-31, 33-35, 37 and 39-53 are pending in the application, with claims 2, 4, 25, 39 and 48-52 being independent. Claims 1, 32, 36, and 38 have been canceled, and claims 48-53 have been withdrawn.

Applicant affirms the election of claims 1-47 in response to the restriction.

The title has been amended in response to the Examiner's objection. No new matter has been added.

In response to the Examiner's claim objections, the claims have been amended to reference compounds having "high molecular weight." In addition, claims 4, 8 and 29 have been amended in response to the Examiner's other objections.

Claims 4, 9-11, 25, 30 and 31 have been rejected as being anticipated by Aziz.

With respect to independent claim 4 and its dependent claims 9-11, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Aziz does not describe or suggest an organic compound layer that includes two different high-molecular weight compounds, as recited in claim 4. The Examiner indicates that Aziz meets this limitation through the disclosure of polyamine and a stilbene derivative. However, as set forth in the McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms, Fifth Edition, at page 1922, lines 53-56, a copy of which is attached, stilbene is just a monomer having a formula of $C_6H_5CH:CHC_6H_5$, and, accordingly, is not a high-molecular weight compound.

With respect to independent claim 25 and its dependent claims 30 and 31, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Aziz does not describe or suggest an organic compound layer that includes a low-molecular weight compound and a high-molecular weight compound selected from the group consisting of polythiophene derivative, polydialkylfluorene derivative and polyphenylene derivative, as recited in claim 25.

Claims 5-8, which depend from claim 4, and claims 26-29, which depend from claim 25, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Aziz in view of So. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because So does not remedy the failure of Aziz to describe or suggest the subject matter of claims 4 and 25.

Claims 2, 3, 12-17, 20-23, 33 and 34 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Aziz in view of Fujita. With respect to claims 12-17 and 20-23, which depend from claim 4, and claims 33 and 34, which depend from claim 25, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Fujita does not remedy the failure of Aziz to describe or suggest the subject matter of claims 4 and 25.

As to independent claim 2 and its dependent claim 3, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Aziz, Fujita, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests a third material doped as a guest in a mixed region of an organic compound layer that includes two compounds, one of which is a high-molecular weight compound, as recited in claim 2. While Fujita describes a third organic compound for light emission between a hole transporting compound and an electron transporting compound, this material is not doped as a guest in a mixed region. Rather, Fujita's light emitting layer 5 is interposed between an electron injection restraining layer 4 and an electron transporting layer 7. (See Fujita at Fig. 3 and col. 9, lines 12-23.)

Claims 18, 19, 22 and 24, which depend from claim 4, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Aziz in view of Fujita and Tsutsui. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Tsutsui does not remedy the failure of Aziz and Fujita to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 4.

Claim 39 and its dependent claims 40 and 43-46 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Aziz in view of So and Fujita. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Aziz, So, Fujita, nor any combination of the three describes or suggests a third organic compound doped as a guest in a mixed region of an organic compound layer that includes a high-molecular weight compound and a low-molecular weight compound, as recited in claim 39. As discussed above with respect to claim 2, Aziz and Fujita fail to describe or suggest such an arrangement. As So does not remedy this failure, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 41, 42, 46 and 47, which depend from claim 39, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Aziz in view of So, Fujita and Tsutsui. Applicant requests reconsideration and

Applicant : Satoshi Seo et al.
Serial No. : 10/043,786
Filed : January 10, 2002
Page : 15 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-291001 / US5434

withdrawal of this rejection because Tsutsui does not remedy the failure of Aziz, So and Fujita to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 39.

Enclosed is a \$110 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/3/04



John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37, 640

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331